

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor  
K-12 Public Schools  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Jill Louzao

SAC Chair: Jessica Houghtaling

Superintendent: Dr. Burke

Date of School Board Approval: pending

Last Modified on: 10/26/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

*Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.*

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification (s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					<p>Return to Normal View</p> <p>School Accountability Reports Text Index Custom Search Site Index Directories FAQs</p> <p>-----</p> <p>You selected: District: LEE Years: 2009-2010, 2008-2009, 2007-2008, 2006-2007, 2005-2006, 2004-2005, 2003-2004, 2002-2003, 2001-2002, 2000-2001, 1999-2000, 1998-1999 School Grades: Report Type: School Grades Modify Selections   Return to List of Schools   Export to MS Excel Format</p>

Principal	Jill Louzao	Masters Leadership	5	21	<p>----- -----</p> <p>School Accountability Report Click on the column header to re-sort by that column. School Year (Click on year to see detailed report) (Includes Learning Gains) more info % Meeting High Standards in Reading % Meeting High Standards in Math % Meeting High Standards in Writing % Meeting High Standards in Science % Making Learning Gains in Reading % Making Learning Gains in Math % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading % of Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math Bonus points for 11th-12th grade Retakes Points Earned (Sum of Previous 9 Columns) more info Percent Tested % In Lowest Reading Level(s) % Level 2 and Above FCAT Reading % Level 3 and Above FCAT Reading % Level 2 and Above FCAT Math % Level 3 and Above FCAT Math % 3 and Above on FCAT Writing Lee 0763 MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Elementary B 66 65 90 34 53 66 45 80 NA 499 100 90 79 0763 Elementary C 77 67 86 28 60 51 55 55 NA 479 100 87 76 0763 Elementary B 67 63 80 34 67 62 71 72 NA 516 100 84 79</p> <p>* Schools that serve high school grade levels will receive a grade based on a weighting of FCAT-based components and non-FCAT-based components proportional to the number and level of non-high-school grades taught at the school at tested grade levels. The word "Pending" will appear as their school grade until the non-FCAT-based components are available near the end of 2010. Please see the 2009-2010 School Grades Technical Assistance Paper (<a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0910/2010SchoolGradesTAP.pdf">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0910/2010SchoolGradesTAP.pdf</a>) or page 2 of the guide sheet at <a href="http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0910/Guidesheet2010SchoolGrades.pdf">http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/0910/Guidesheet2010SchoolGrades.pdf</a>"&gt; for additional information.</p> <p>Guides to the Calculations 2010 School Grades Guide Sheet (PDF) School Grades Technical Assistance Paper 2009-10 (PDF) Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Technical Assistance Paper 2009-10 (PDF) Alternative School Improvement Ratings Technical Assistance Paper 2009-10 (PDF) High School Grading Requirements (PowerPoint) High School Grading Requirements (Rich Text Format)</p> <p>DOE Home   Commissioner   Board of Education   Contact Us   DOE Paperless   Open Government   Site Index For questions &amp; comments regarding education issues: <a href="mailto:Commissioner@fldoe.org">Commissioner@fldoe.org</a>   For questions &amp; comments regarding this Web site: E-mail Webmaster Accessibility   Copyright Florida Department of Education ©2005   Privacy Statement   Public Records Free Downloads: Acrobat Reader   Excel Viewer 2003   Word Viewer 97/2000   PowerPoint Viewer 2003 Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public-records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.</p>
Assis Principal	Mark McDonagh	Masters Ed Leadership	3	3	same as above

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Carrie Jarman	Bachelors	5	3	
Reading	Sue Rosema	Bachelors	5	3	
Reading	Carrie McKinley	Bachelors	5	3	
Math	Mark Macchia	Masters	1	1	
Math	Lisa Flannery	Masters	5	1	
ESOL	Luz Sierra	Masters	5	1	

### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	PDSA Process	Administration	June 2013	
2	Common Planning	Administration	June 2013	
3	Team Data Meetings	Administration	June 2013	
4	Professional Learning Communities	Administration	June 2013	
5	Teachers will participate in a minimum of two professional development activities	Steve Eckstein	June 2013	
6	Increase the percent of teachers ESOL certified	Administration	June 2013	
7	Increase the percent of teachers who complete the choosing excellence training	Administration	June 2013	

### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

\*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
26% (17)	ESOL classes are provided through curriculum and staff development.

### Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

\*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
66	7.6%(5)	43.9%(29)	24.2%(16)	24.2%(16)	39.4%(26)	92.4%(61)	9.1%(6)	1.5%(1)	63.6%(42)

### Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Lisa Flannery	Jessica O'Donnell	This is Mrs. O'Donnell's first year teaching at Manatee. Both teachers are teaching on the same grade level.	Observation, feedback
Lisa Flannery	Taylor Giany	This is Ms. Giany's first year teaching at Manatee. She has taken over Ms. Flannery's IL class that she has taught for 5 years at Manatee. Ms. Flannery is the best fit for support.	Observation, feedback
Carrie Jarman	Daniel White	This is Mr. White's first year teaching at Manatee. Mrs. Jarman has been the 3rd grade reading coach for the past three years.	Observation, feedback
Carrie McKinley	Julia Sullivan	Ms. Sullivan is in her first full year of teaching. Mrs. McKinley has taught for many years and will provide great behavior strategies that can be utilized.	Observation, feedback
Carrie Jarman	Jaime Cochran	This is Mrs. Cochran's first year at Manatee. Mrs. Jarman has been the third grade reading coach for the past three years.	Observation, feedback
Luz Sierra	Alyssa Casais	This is Ms. Casais' first year teaching. Mrs. Sierra has taught 5th grade for many years.	Observation, feedback

### ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

### Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

#### Title I, Part A

Title I, Title II and other programs coordinate through the SIP process. Each school completes a needs assessment before writing goals for the year. School improvement plans are written to ensure compliance with all state and national regulations. All school improvement plans are reviewed at the district level for appropriate use of funds and effective use of resources. This district level review prevents duplication of services and facilitates coordination between schools and departments. This collaboration ensures that all programs support schools.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title I, Part C to provide expanded academic enrichment opportunities to Migrant students. Services include after school tutorials in reading and math; health services; and literacy workshops for parents as a result of the coordination of these funds. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs

#### Title I, Part D

The facilities and schools coordinate with health services (mental and physical) and other social services to meet the need of students returning back to their assigned educational facility. The district Health Services, Student Services, Title I, Title III and ESE departments are all a part of the collaborative effort. For example: social workers from student services has the process and procedures in place to assist students and their families with social services for food stamps and other health services; the ESE Department has established a memorandum of understanding for assistance with housing and counseling services through Ruth Cooper and the Lutheran Service; vocational instructors establish partnership with businesses so students will have an opportunity to continue to develop their vocational skill.

#### Title II

Title II  
Title I coordinates with other programs funded under NCLB through the SIP (School Improvement Plan) process. Within this plan, schools complete a Professional Development Plan in collaboration with Title II. The PDP is concentrated in reading, math, science and writing to meet the needs of the targeted subgroups not making AYP. The PDP includes teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators. As part of the School Advisory Council, parents are included in this planning process. Each school completes a needs assessment before writing goals for the year. School improvement plans are written to ensure compliance with all state and national regulations. This collaboration ensures that all programs funded under NCLB use funds to support schools, not supplant district obligations. All school improvement plans are reviewed at the district level for appropriate use of funds and effectiveness. This district level review prevents duplication of services and facilitates coordination between agencies. Each school's SIP is reviewed by all stakeholders and submitted to the Board for approval. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

#### Title III

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title III to expand academic enrichment opportunities for ELLs. These services include after school tutorials, professional development, supplemental scientifically research based resources and materials. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

#### Title X- Homeless

Title X coordinates with Title I, Part A, to provide comparable services to homeless children who are not attending Title I schools. By providing ongoing collaboration between Title X and Title I, Part A, program staff, the same services for homeless students in non Title I schools are provided to homeless students in Title I schools. In addition to serving homeless students not enrolled in Title I schools, set-aside funds are used to provide services to homeless students who are attending Title I schools. Homeless students who attend Title I school-wide or targeted assistance schools may have unique challenges that are not addressed by the regular Title I program at these schools. These challenges may create barriers to full participation in Title I programs and defeat the overarching program goal of helping all students meet challenging state standards. For instance, students residing in shelters, motels, or other overcrowded conditions may not have a quiet place to study at the end of the day and may require extended after-school library time; tutoring and/or accessibility to tutoring as needed, school supplies, expedited evaluations, extended days/ learning opportunities, Saturday schools, summer academic camps, coordination of services with shelters or other homeless service providers, or, a student who is dealing with the stress and anxiety associated with homelessness may not be able to focus on his or her studies and may benefit from school counseling services. Through Title I, Part A, or Title I, Part A, in conjunction with Title X, McKinney-Vento funding homeless students can take part in services that enable them to benefit more from a school's Title I program.

## Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI is used to provide unique learning programs at schools. SAI funds are also used to fund summer school programs throughout the District. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

## Violence Prevention Programs

The Youth Coalitions within Lee County provide opportunities for partnerships between the District and other social services. These social services assist all at-risk students through after-school programs that include academic, social, and health services. Anticipated outcomes include a safe environment for children and increased academic achievement. Bullying prevention programs are offered throughout the District. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

## Nutrition Programs

Food and Nutrition Services offers healthy meals to all students. This includes ensuring that families are offered free and reduced lunch applications throughout the year. All students receive free breakfast at all school locations. Many Title I schools have also developed "Backpack Programs" in which nutritious food is sent home in a backpack each weekend to struggling families to ensure that children and families have food throughout the week. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

## Housing Programs

## Head Start

Activities with Early Childhood include three blended VPK/Title I classrooms for four-year olds. This is a voluntary program that identifies high-risk students to receive a full year of educational opportunities. The benefits for students include readiness for Kindergarten and focusing on building literacy for early reading skills. The expected outcome is for the four-year old who participates in the programs to be able to perform at the readiness level in all areas of the kindergarten readiness screening. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

## Adult Education

Adult Education partners with several Title I schools to offer ESOL classes for parents to learn English. Adult Education partners with Title I, Part A to offer paraprofessional classes to prepare paraprofessionals to take the qualifying test, ParaPro. Adult Education instructors review reading, math and writing skills, as well as test administration. Title I paraprofessionals benefit by becoming highly qualified as defined by NCLB. The benefit of these classes is to help the monolingual parents learn English so that they can become more self-sufficient. Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

## Career and Technical Education

The district provides extensive opportunity for Career and Technical Education including Industry Certification. Each attendance zone also includes a comprehensive high school with career academies.

## Job Training

## Other

Periodic district level meetings with managers of all programs funded under NCLB also open lines of communication and encourage cooperation between programs.

## Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RTI)

### School-based MTSS/RTI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS/RTI Leadership Team for Manatee Elementary consists of the following members:  
Mark McDonagh - Assistant Principal  
Pam Strickland - Curriculum Specialist  
Barbara Lyon - Guidance Counselor  
Sue Rosema - Reading teacher  
Carrie Jarman - Reading teacher  
Carry McKinely - Reading teacher

Tracy Rosenthal - Math teacher  
Mark Macchia - Math teacher  
Sharon Marchon - School Psychologist

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS/RTI Leadership team at Manatee Elementary meets weekly, monthly, or as needed to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Intervention Manual.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RTI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

Describe how the school-based RTI Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RTI efforts?

The MTSS/RTI Leadership team at Manatee Elementary meets on a weekly, monthly, or as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Intervention Manual. The roles of each member are as follows:

#### Classroom Teacher

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a RTI folder (DIBELS, curriculum assessments, SAT 10 or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotes) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing
- Attend RTI Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling
- Implement interventions designed by RTI Team for students in Tier 2 & 3
- Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

#### Reading or Math Coach/Specialist

- Attend RTI Team meetings
- Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- Keep progress monitoring notes & anecdotes of interventions implemented
- Administer screenings
- Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

#### Speech-Language Pathologist

- Attend RTI Team meetings for some Tier 2 & Tier 3 students
- Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions
- Assist with Tier 2 & 3 interventions through collaboration, training, and/or direct student contact
- Incorporate RTI data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral & when making eligibility decisions

#### Principal/Assistant Principal

- Facilitate implementation of RTI in your building
- Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- Assign paraprofessionals to support RTI implementation when possible
- Attend RTI Team meetings to be active in the RTI change process
- Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

#### Guidance Counselor/Curriculum Specialist

- Often RTI Team facilitators
- Schedule and attend RTI Team meetings
- Maintain log of all students involved in the RTI process
- Send parent invites
- Complete necessary RTI forms
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

#### School Psychologist

- Attend RTI Team meetings on some students in Tier 2 & on all students in Tier 3
- Monitor data collection process for fidelity
- Review & interpret progress monitoring data
- Collaborate with RTI Team on effective instruction & specific interventions
- Incorporate RTI data when guiding a possible ESE referral & when making eligibility decisions

#### ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

- Consult with RTI Team regarding Tier 3 interventions
- Incorporate RTI data when making eligibility decisions

Specialist (Behavior, OT, PT, ASD)

- Consult with RTI Team
- Provide staff trainings

Social Worker

- Attend RTI Team meetings when requested
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with RTI Team

ESOL/ELL Representative

- Attend all RTI Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments
- Provide ELL interventions at all tiers

## MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Manatee utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analyses assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS Problem-Solving team at Manatee Elementary school here meets on a weekly, monthly, as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to identify students in need of further support and monitor the progress of students receiving interventions to ensure that the needs of all students are being met within a multi-tiered system of student supports. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's MTSS Manual. The roles of each member are outlined above.

The teams are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies. All team members are provided on-going staff development training regarding the RTI process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Specialist and three Reading Tutors.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The team meets bi-monthly. Data is desegregated, and the Tutor from each grade level leads the discussion pertaining to their grade and group of students. We gage how we are progressing towards targets set in Reading

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

Maintaining and raising levels of 3,4,5 students. Focusing on high level 2 and low level 3 students. The team will identify and track the lowest 25% of students in each grade level based on last years FCAT score or SAT 10 score. They will then make sure these students are being seen by the reading tutors in grades 3-5 and that they teachers are aware of them and doing making sure they are double checking their understanding.



---

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/4/2012)

### \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

All students are assessed prior to or upon entering within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter Knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction.

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

**Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.**

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

### \*High Schools Only

**Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.**

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

### Postsecondary Transition

**Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.**

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In 2011-12, 44% of our students scored Level 3 on FCAT Reading. In 12-13, we will improve to 55% while maintaining or increasing the percentage of levels 4/5 as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (184)	55% (231)

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Maintaining levels of proficiency				FCAT
2	Increasing levels of proficiency	Reading tutors will focus on students who fall in the lowest 33% of students in their grade level.	Sue Rosema Carrie McKinley Carrie Jarman	District reading assessments Treasures unit tests Individual IRI's	FCAT
3	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teachers	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In 2011-12, 18% of our students scored Level 4 on FCAT Reading. In 12-13, we will improve to 20% as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (75)	20% (83)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Background knowledge Comprehension Vocabulary	STAR	Classroom teacher	Treasures reading assessments	FCAT
2	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In 2011-12, 55% of our students made a learning gain on FCAT Reading. In 12-13, we will improve to 65% as measured by FCAT 2.0
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (231)	65% (273)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Comprehension Vocabulary Background knowledge	STAR ESOL and SIOP strategies Higher order thinking questions	Classroom teachers	Treasures reading assessments	FCAT
2	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teachers	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT
3	Strategic readers	With the use of anchor charts, teach students strategies that good readers use when ready	Classroom teacher	Treasures reading assessments	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3b:	
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	In 2011-12, 62% of our lowest 25% made a learning gain on FCAT Reading. In 12-13, we will improve to 64% as measured by FCAT 2.0
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (65)	64% (68)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Reading Comprehension	Using reading tutors for pull out and small group instruction. STAR strategy	Reading tutors Classroom teachers	Treasures reading assessments Classroom assessments	FCAT
2	Background knowledge	QAR Close Reading Read alouds	Classroom teachers	Treasures reading assessments Classroom assessments	FCAT
3	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teachers	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	In 2011-2012 the AMO was 51%, the goal for 2012-2013 is 55%					
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	51	55	60	64	69	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The 2012 report showed the following: 61% of White students, 33% of Black students, and 42% of Hispanic students scored at or above grade level in reading. In 2013 the data will improve to show that 53% of Black students and 54% of Hispanic students will score at or above grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 33% (42) White 61% (46) Hispanic 42% (66)	Black 53% (68) Hispanic 54% (85)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Vocabulary Background knowledge	STAR	Classroom teachers	Treasures reading assessments	FCAT

Comprehension		Classroom assessments	
---------------	--	-----------------------	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In 2012 68% of ELL students did not score a level 3 or higher in reading. In 2013, 57% of ELL students will not score a level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (44)	57% (37)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Reading comprehension Vocabulary	Higher order thinking questions STAR ESOL strategies SIOP	Classroom teacher	Treasures reading assessments	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In 2011-12, 80% of our SWD students did not score a Level 3 on FCAT Reading. In 12-13, we will improve to 64% of students not making a Level 3 as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (62)	64% (49)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Vocabulary Reading comprehension	STAR Higher order thinking questions	Classroom teacher	Treasures reading assessments	FCAT
2	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT
	Increase levels of	Small implicit instruction	Reading tutor	Treasures reading	FCAT

3	proficiency	given in small groups arranged around individual skills	assessments
---	-------------	---	-------------

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In 2012, 58% of our Economically Disadvantaged students did not score a Level 3 on FCAT Reading. In 12-13, we will improve to 47% as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42%	53%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Reading comprehension Vocabulary	STAR Reading tutors Differentiated instruction	Classroom teachers Reading tutors	Treasures reading assessments	FCAT
2	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan	All	Teachers on Kagan committee.	grade level representation	Training in July, monthly schedule of structures, bi-monthly structure at faculty meetings	Lesson plans, classroom observation, walk throughs, peer walk throughs	Administration
Common Core	All	Teachers trained over the summer	Grade level	Throughout the year	Lesson plans, walk throughs	Administration
Strategic Reading	1,2,3,4,5	Reading Coach	all 1,2,3,4,5 teachers	September October	Walk-throughs peer visits Reading coach and Reading Specialist visits team meetings	Administration
					Lesson Plans Walk throughs	

Choosing Excellence	All	District	Groups of 8 K-5 teachers	Three times during the 2012 school year	Team meetings Peer visits Grade level agendas	Administration
Compass	K, 1,2,3,4,5	Teacher trainers	all K, 1,2,3,4,5 teachers	September October	Classroom visits Lesson plans Compass reports	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Strategic Reading	anchor chart materials, center support resources and activities	Title I	\$10,000.00
Kagan	Kagan mats, books, manipulatives	Title I	\$30,000.00
Common Core		Title I	\$35,000.00
			Subtotal: \$75,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$75,000.00

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)).

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		In 2011-12, 39% of our students were proficient on the listening/speaking portion of the CELLA. In 12-13, we will improve to 50% as measured by the CELLA.			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
39% (9)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool



1	Language	Use of an ESOL Teacher to work with LY students to help fill in gaps and reinforce instruction in the classroom.	Luz Sierra	Weekly assessments	CELLA
2	Parent Involvement	Parent Breakfasts Parent Workshops through FGCU	Adela Hernandez Administration Mark Macchia	Sign in sheets	CELLA

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

In 2011-12, 21% of our students were proficient on the reading portion of the CELLA. In 12-13, we will improve to 30% as measured by the CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

21% (25)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Language	Use of an ESOL specialist to work with LY students to help fill in gaps and reinforce instruction in the classroom.	Luz Sierra	Weekly assessments	CELLA
2	Parent Involvement	Monthly breakfasts Parent Workshops through FGCU Partnering Parents	Adela Hernandez Administration Mark Macchia	Sign in sheets	CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

In 2011-12, 23% of our students were proficient on the writing portion of the CELLA. In 12-13, we will improve to 35% as measured by the CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

23% (27)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parent Involvement	Monthly breakfasts Parent Workshops through FGCU	Adela Hernandez Administration Mark Macchia	Sign in sheets	CELLA

		Partnering Parents			
2	Language	Use of an ESOL specialist to work with LY students to help fill in gaps and reinforce instruction in the classroom.	Luz Sierra	Weekly assessments	CELLA

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In 2011-12, 41% of our students scored Level 3 on FCAT Math. In 12-13, we will improve to 53% as measured by FCAT 2.0 while maintaining or increasing the percentage at Levels 4/5
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (172)	53% (222)

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Maintaining levels of proficiency				FCAT
2	Multiplication tables Reading difficulties	Math facts in a flash Identifying key words in work problems Math tutor	Classroom teacher	Tracking % of students who score 80% or higher on topic tests	FCAT
3	Multiplication tables	Math facts in a flash Flash cards	Classroom teacher Parent	Charting students who master addition/ subtraction in k-2 and multiplication/ division in 3-5	Charts FCAT
4	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher Student	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT
5	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Hosting a Family Math Night	Administration	Number of students who attend	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In 2011-12, 16% of our students scored Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Math. In 12-13, we will improve to 21% as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (67)	21% (88)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Multiplication tables Reading difficulties	Math facts in a flash Identifying key words in work problems Math tutor	Classroom teacher	Tracking % of students who score 80% or higher on cumulative topic tests	FCAT
2	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teachers	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT
3	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Hosting a Family Math Night	Administration	Number of students who attend	FCAT
4	Multiplication tables	Math facts in a flash Flash cards	Classroom teacher Parent	Charting students who master addition/ subtraction in k-2 and multiplication/ division in 3-5	Charts FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2011-12, 50% of our students made learning gains on FCAT Math. In 12-13, we will improve to 55% as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (210)	55% (231)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Multiplication tables Reading difficulties	Math facts in a flash Identifying key words in work problems Math tutor	Classroom teacher	% of students scoring 80% or higher on cumulative topic tests	FCAT
2	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Hosting a Family Math Night	Administration	Number of students who attend	FCAT
3	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT
4	Multiplication tables	Math facts in a flash Flash cards	Classroom teacher Parent	Charting students who master addition/ subtraction in k-2 and multiplication/ division in 3-5	Charts FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2011-12, 55% of our lowest 25% made a learning gain on FCAT Math. In 12-13, we will improve to 61% as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (57)	61% (64)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Multiplication tables	Math facts in a flash  Flash cards	Classroom teacher  Parent	Charting students who master addition/ subtraction in k-2 and multiplication/ division in 3-5	Charts  FCAT
2	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Hosting a Family Math Night	Administration	Number of students who attend	FCAT
3	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs  Partner visits  Student growth	FCAT

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	49	53	58	63	67	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	The 2012 report showed the following: 49% of White students, 32% of Black students, and 44% of Hispanic students scored at or above grade level in math. In 2013 the data will improve to show that 55% of White students, 51% of Black students and 52% of Hispanic students will score at or above grade level.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 49% (37) Black 32% (41) Hispanic 44% (69)	White 55% (41) Black 51% (65) Hispanic 52% (82)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Multiplication tables Reading difficulties	Math facts in a flash Identifying key words in work problems Math tutor	Classroom teacher	Tracking % of students who score 80% or higher on cumulative topic math tests	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	In 2011-12, 73% of our ELL students did not make satisfactory progress on FCAT Math. In 12-13, we will improve to 50% not making progress as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (48)	50% (33)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Reading difficulties	Identifying key words in work problems Math tutor	Classroom teacher	Tracking % of students who score 80% or higher on cumulative topic math tests	FCAT
2	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Hosting a Family Math Night	Administration	Number of students who attend	FCAT
3	Reading difficulties	Key vocabulary	Tutor	Topic test scores	FCAT
4	Multiplication tables	Math facts in a flash Flash cards	Classroom teacher Parent	Charting students who master addition/ subtraction in k-2 and multiplication/ division in 3-5	Charts FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2011-12, 84% of our ELL students did not make satisfactory progress on FCAT Math. In 12-13, we will improve to 70% as measured by FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% (65)	70% (54)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Reading difficulties	Identifying key words in work problems Math tutor	Classroom teacher	Tracking % of students who score 80% or higher on cumulative topic math tests	FCAT
2	Multiplication tables	Math facts in a flash Flash cards	Classroom teacher Parent	Charting students who master addition/subtraction in k-2 and multiplication/ division in 3-5	Charts FCAT
3	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Hosting a Family Math Night	Administration	Number of students who attend	FCAT
4	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The 2012 AYP report showed that 59% of Economically Disadvantaged students did not score at or above grade level in Math. In 2013 the data will improve to 48% not scoring at or above grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%	48%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Reading difficulties	Identifying key words in work problems Math tutor	Classroom teacher	Tracking % of students who score 80% or higher on cumulative topic math tests	FCAT
2	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT
3	Maintaining levels of proficiency	Hosting a Family Math Night	Administration	Number of students who attend	FCAT
4	Multiplication tables	Math facts in a flash Flash cards	Classroom teacher Parent	Charting students who master addition/subtraction in k-2 and multiplication/ division in 3-5	Charts FCAT



Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Compass	K-5 teachers	Teacher trainers	All K-5 teachers	September October	Classroom visits Lesson plans Team meetings	Administration
Common Core Math	K-5 teachers	Teacher trainers	All K-5 teachers	Pre-school	Lesson Plans Walk throughs Team meetings	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core Math	Math Flash cards	Title I	\$35,000.00
			Subtotal: \$35,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$35,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.  Science Goal # 1a:	In 2011-2012, 38% of students were proficient on FCAT Science, in 2012-2013 44% will be proficient while maintaining or increasing the percentage of levels 4/5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (53)	44% (61)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Maintaining levels of proficiency				FCAT
2	Reading Comprehension Background Knowledge	Science lab Introduction of new vocabulary	Classroom teacher Science specialist	Achieve data Topic tests	FCAT
3	Increasing levels of proficiency	Classroom teachers will incorporate quality tools into their daily routines including data folders, data walls, PDSA's, Plus/Delta's, class meetings	Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs Partner visits Student growth	FCAT
4	Maintaining and increasing levels of proficiency	P-SELL program	Classroom teacher	Test data	FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  
Science Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  
Science Goal #2a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PSELL	5	District	Grade 5 teachers	August and September	Visits from PSELL reps walk throughs	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00

			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:	In 2011-2012, 77% of students were proficient on FCAT Writes; in 2012-2013 81% will be proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (93)	81% (99)

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Number of new teachers and students to Manatee	Train all new teachers in the writing process used at Manatee. Work with students new to Manatee intensively to ensure that standards are met.	Administration and teachers	Monthly writing assessment tracked on share point	FCAT Writes

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
FCAT Writes	3,4	Lisa Murphy Helen Davis	All 3,4 teachers	September 11,18	classroom visits	Administration
Quick Writes	3,4	Lisa Murphy Helen Davis	All 3,4 teachers	August, Early September	Student Notebooks Classroom Walk Throughs	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Write	Rubric training, Classroom materials	Title I	\$1,000.00
Quick Writes	notebooks, prompts	Title I	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,000.00

*End of Writing Goals*

Attendance Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:		
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:	
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. Suspension				
Suspension Goal # 1:				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions		
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School		
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>In 2011-2012 Manatee had 1166 volunteer hours, in 2012-2013 our goal is to exceed 1400 volunteer hours.</p>



2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
1166 hours	1400 hours

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Families are spread so far out around the three subzones	Combine events, give more advanced notice, host free events	Parent Involvement Specialist	Parent logs	Parent logs

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Night	All	District Math Coach	Teachers Parents	October 23	Sign sheets Feedback forms	Administration
Parenting Partner	all	District	Parent Involvement Specialist and 3 classroom teachers	September	Agendas, sign-in sheets, feedback from Parent workshop	Administration
Student Led Conferences	All	Principal from a school who has done several years of conferences and has had formal training	All teachers	October 18	sign sheets observation	Administration
Curious Kids	All	FGCU staff	All parents invited	Monthly for 2012 school year	Sign in sheets	Administration

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

## Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

## Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

## STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Strategic Reading	anchor chart materials, center support resources and activities	Title I	\$10,000.00
Reading	Kagan	Kagan mats, books, manipulatives	Title I	\$30,000.00
Reading	Common Core		Title I	\$35,000.00
Mathematics	Common Core Math	Math Flash cards	Title I	\$35,000.00
Writing	FCAT Write	Rubric training, Classroom materials	Title I	\$1,000.00
Writing	Quick Writes	notebooks, prompts	Title I	\$2,000.00
				Subtotal: \$113,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$113,000.00

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/20/2012)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
-------------------------------------	--------

No data submitted

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year

SAC will hold meetings August 14th, October 23rd, January 15th, April 2nd and one in October to approve SIP as soon as AMO data is available. SAC also participates in school activities. In October there is a Fall Festival and bookfair in which SAC members participate. Winter Wonderland is in January and SAC members will also assist in the planning and implementation of that event. In March we celebrate Dr. Seuss' birthday with an evening activity in which SAC members will help plan and oversee activities.

# AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012  
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011  
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	71%	84%	40%	266	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	65%	58%			123	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	57% (YES)	61% (YES)			118	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					507	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District MANATEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	66%	65%	90%	34%	255	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	53%	66%			119	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	45% (NO)	80% (YES)			125	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					499	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested